

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ALEXANDER RODRIGUEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNICITY INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00754-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 34]

Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend case management deadlines. Docket No. 34.

A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). “The diligence obligation is ongoing.” *Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D. Ariz. 2012). The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the entire period of time already allowed. *See Muniz v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 731 F.Supp.2d 961, 967 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (quoting *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 605, 607 (E.D. Cal. 1999)). When diligence has not been shown in support of an extension request, “the inquiry should end.” *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609.

In the instant stipulation, the parties seek to extend case management deadlines by sixty days. Docket No. 34. The justification provided for this request is that “[t]he parties are hopeful they may be able to resolve the dispute during the [ENE] and seek an extension to the discovery deadlines to allow the parties to engage in confidential settlement discussions before expending significant funds to conduct discovery.” Docket No. 34 at 3. However, the parties’ assertion that additional time is needed to engage in settlement discussions does not establish good cause for the

1 extension sought. *See Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1181 (D. Nev.
2 2022) (“As such, it is well-settled that the existence of settlement talks or the potential for
3 alternative dispute resolution is not, standing alone, sufficient to establish good cause for an
4 extension of the case management deadlines.”). Further, the parties have conducted virtually no
5 affirmative discovery. *See* Docket No. 34 at 2. Therefore, the Court cannot find diligence.

6 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the parties’ stipulation without prejudice. Docket No.
7 34.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: October 2, 2025

10
11 
12 Nancy J. Koppe
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28